



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/685,280	10/14/2003	Wolfgang Hirschburger	0212.66894	4919

⁷⁵⁹⁰
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

10/29/2009

EXAMINER

PAUL, DISLER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2614

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/29/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address : COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10685280	10/14/2003	HIRSCHBURGER ET AL.	0212.66894

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.
Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, IL 60606

EXAMINER

DISLER PAUL

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

2614	20091008
------	----------

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is in response to the return of the appeal case as noted on 6/23/09 in regard to the inconsistency between the examiner's answer and the final rejection. It was indicated on the examiner's answer that claims 9-11, 19-21 as being rejected over Smith (2002/0158604) and Bhagwat (4,835,409) and Kelly (4,845,409) and Furusho et al. (US D479,223). Whereas, in the final rejection mailed on 3/24/08 which stated that claims 7-11, 17-21 were rejected over Smith (2002/0158604) and Bhagwat (4,835,409) and Kelly (4,845,409).

The inconsistencies between the examiner's answer and the final rejected as noted above was merely a typo error made by the examiner in the final rejection of the claims and there was no new ground of rejection and thus, such typo error is merely corrected in the examiner's answer with the following: Claims 7-8, 17-18 as being rejected over Smith (2002/0158604) and Bhagwat et al. (US 4,835,409) and Kelly (6,921,59), while, claims 9-11, 19-21 as being rejected over Smith (2002/0158604) and Bhagwat et al. (US 4,835,409) and Kelly (6,921,59) and Furusho et al. (D479,223).

/Xu Mei/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2614